

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 12, 2006. Claims 37 to 59 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 37, 41, 44, 50, 53, 58 and 59 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action entered a restriction requirement between Group I (Claims 37 to 43, 50 to 52 and 58) and Group II (Claims 44 to 49, 53 to 57 and 59). Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the Group I claims, namely Claims 37 to 43, 50 to 52 and 58. The restriction requirement is, however, traversed.

In this regard, Claim 44 is directed to an image display device that is encompassed by the image display system of Claim 37. Therefore, since Claim 37 has been elected, Claim 44 should also be included.

In addition, traversal is on the grounds that there would not be an undue burden on the Examiner in examining both groups of claims in the same application.

Traversal is on the ground that there would not be undue burden in examining all five groups of claims in a single application. In particular, MPEP § 808 makes clear that in order to require restriction between independent or distinct inventions, reasons for insisting upon a restriction requirement, such as undue burden, must also be shown.

In the present instance, the Office Action states that two groups are related as combination and subcombination. However, as stated above, the system claim of Claim 37 necessarily includes the device claim of Claim 44. Therefore, Applicants election of the system claim would necessarily require a search for art relevant to the incorporated device claim. Therefore, is not believed that there would be undue burden in examining the two

groups of claims in a single application since they are not so different as would require a burden on the Examiner that is significantly beyond that of the normal burdens of examination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Claims 38, 45, 47 to 49, 54, 56 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Without conceding the correctness of the rejections, the claims have been amended to make the subject matter therein clearer. Additionally, the amendments to Claim 38 does not narrow the scope of the claim, but rather, merely corrects a typographical error in which a lower case t was included in the formula rather than an upper case T. Similarly, the amendments to Claims 45 and 54 do not narrow the scope of the claims, but rather broaden the scope by not requiring that the updated be performed "in order". Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 111B04v1